Amendments to the Drawings:

Please replace original drawings Figs. 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B and 14 with the amended drawings found at the end of this paper marked "Replacement Sheets".

REMARKS

Applicant has amended the specification, drawings and claims to more particularly define the invention taking into consideration the outstanding Official Action. The specification has been amended at paragraph [0026] to correct the reference number from "641" to "64" which is simply a typographical error.

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the reference number 64. Therefore, Applicant has amended Figures 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B and 14 to correct the reference number from "641" to "64". The drawing sheets are found at the end of this paper and marked "Replacement Sheets". Accordingly, the objection to the drawings has been obviated and therefore it is most respectfully requested that this objection be withdrawn.

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation from claim 7 thereto. Applicants most respectfully submit that all the claims now present in the application are in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. §112 and are clearly patentable over the references of record.

The rejection of claims 1-2 and 4-9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Huang et al. has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed.

Applicant wishes to direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2131 which states that to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.

> "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim, but this is not an *ipsissimis verbis* test, i.e., identity of terminology is not required. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed.Cir. 1990).

Huang discloses a "semiconductor package with heat dissipating structure" (Fig. 1) which at most may be similar to the structure of claim 1 of the presently claimed invention. However, The Official Action does not specify by reference number what corresponds to the pellets of the present invention. However, Huang claims solder balls 230, but these clearly do not correspond to the presently claimed invention which now defines that the "pellets 66" as "thermally conductive adhesive bodies" (claim 7). Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 1 by incorporating the limitation of claim 7 thereto to overcome this rejection. Accordingly, it is most respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 3 and 10-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Bertin et al. and claim 12 as being unpatentable over Huang in view of Chen et al. and claims 13-14 over Huang in view of McMillan et al. and claim 15 over Huang in view of Bernier et al. has been carefully considered but is most respectfully traversed.

Applicants wish to direct the Examiner's attention to the basic requirements of a prima facie case of obviousness as set forth in the MPEP § 2143. This section states that to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria first must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

Section 2143.03 states that all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). "All words in a claim must be considered in judging the patentability of that claim against the prior art." In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385, 165 USPQ 494, 496 (CCPA 1970). If an

independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Applicants also most respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to MPEP § 2144.08 (page 2100-114) wherein it is stated that Office personnel should consider all rebuttal argument and evidence present by applicant and the citation of In re Soni for error in not considering evidence presented in the specification.

Applicant believes that the amendment to claim has obviated these rejections because the teachings of the secondary reference do not overcome the deficiencies of the primary reference as discussed above. It is most respectfully requested that in view of the above comments and the amendments to the claims these rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the above comments and further amendments to the specification, drawings and claims, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now present in the application are most respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC

By: Richard E. Fichter
Richard E. Fichter
Registration No. 26,382

625 Slaters Lane, 4th Fl.
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
Phone: (703) 683-0500
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

REF:kdd
A02.wpd

June 28, 2005